

## REMARKS

### Status of the Claims:

The Office Action dated September 30, 2005 has been received and reviewed by the applicant. Claims 1-18 are in the application. Claims 1-18 stand rejected.

### Claim Rejection - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-2, 8-11 and 17-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maes et al. (hereinafter, "Maes") (US 6,625,298) in view of Cox (US 6,069,914). The rejection states that "Maes discloses a method for extracting a watermark in a watermarked digital image sequence, having two or more frames (Figure 2, col. 4 lines 36-41), comprising the steps of: a) estimating correspondences (i.e., comparison) between one or more pairs of frames in the watermarked digital image sequence (comparing means 202 estimating correspondence between the *input signal* 201 and an *original input signal* 204, col. 4, lines 42-43). Maes does not expressly disclose the watermark being extracted without using frames from an original unwatermarked digital image sequence. Cox discloses this in his entire reference."

It is respectfully submitted that combining the Maes with Cox as suggested by the rejection would make Maes "unsatisfactory for its intended purpose" since such a combination would render Maes inoperable (i.e., Maes requires and can only operate with the original). MPEP 2143.01 Section THE PROPOSED MODIFICATION CANNOT RENDER THE PRIOR ART UNSATISFACTORY FOR ITS INTENDED PURPOSE states "[i]f proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification." Simply being in the same field of endeavor does not end the inquiry. The rejection has failed to take into consideration other factors stated hereinabove for a prima facie case of obviousness.


As pointed out in the previous amendment response, the claimed invention (claims 1 and 10) has the distinct advantage of *not requiring an original input signal* (support is found on p. 5, lines 29-31, and in Fig. 3 and its corresponding text on p. 9, line 26 to p. 12, line 8).

**Summary**

Should the Examiner consider that additional amendments are necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the favor is requested of a telephone call to the undersigned counsel for the purpose of discussing such amendments.

For the reasons set forth above, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 36,390

Peyton C. Watkins/lam  
Rochester, NY 14650  
Telephone: 585-477-8282  
Facsimile: 585-477-4646

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.